REMARKS

Please reconsider the present application in view of the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering the present application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-6 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 2 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1.

Rejection(s) Under 35 U.S.C § 102

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0016323 ("Ikeda et al."). For the reasons set forth below, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention is directed to a structure of a reflector used for a liquid-crystal display device. As discussed with reference to Fig. 2 of the Specification, the reflector 1 of the present invention includes a plurality of unit regions 3 disposed on a substrate 11. The unit regions 3 each have a common arrangement pattern of a plurality of unit reflective portions 5 of random size. It is noted that a repetition pitch of the unit regions 3 is selected to be larger than a human sight critical limit to prevent the forming of undesirable contrast patterns. *See* paragraphs 0024-0036 of the Specification.

Accordingly, independent claim 1 requires, in part, that the repetition pitch of the unit regions is an integral multiple of the pitch of the pixels of the liquid-crystal display device and more than 5000 μm. Further, independent claim 2 requires, in part, that the repetition pitch

of the unit regions is an integral multiple of the pitch of the pixels of the liquid-crystal display device and more than 10000 μm.

Ikeda et al., in contrast, fails to show or suggest at least the above limitations as recited in claims 1 and 2. Ikeda et al. merely discloses a reflector having a plurality of unit reflection regions. The Examiner attempts to equate a single unit region composed of several sub-unit regions, each of which is denoted by a pitch P of an opening 3, to the unit regions as recited in claims 1 and 2. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Ikeda et al. is directed to a number of unit reflection regions within the pitch P of the opening 3 in order to equalize reflected light intensity. In Ikeda et al., an average array pitch s_1^* of the first unit reflection regions and an average array pitch s_2^* of the second unit reflection regions are defined as:

$s_1^* = p / n_1$;

$s_2^* = p / n_2$ (where n_1 and n_2 are natural numbers of 2 or more) (*See* Paragraphs 0089-0092 and Fig. 10).

As is apparent from this, the size of each of the unit reflection regions of Ikeda et al. is smaller than the pitch P of the opening 3. Thus, the first unit reflection regions, for example, are repeatedly arranged by the pitch s_1^*. If, *arguendo,* the single unit region is composed of the several sub-unit regions as noted by the Examiner, the first unit reflection regions appear at regular intervals within the asserted single unit region. This may cause the forming of undesirable contrast patters because it would be apparent to one ordinary skilled in the art that the repetition pitch of the unit reflection regions is smaller than the human sight critical limit. Ikeda et al. is completely silent with respect to the repetition pitch of the unit regions as recited in claims 1 and 2.

In view of above, Ikeda et al. fails to show or suggest the present invention as recited in claims 1 and 2. Thus, independent claims 1 and 2 are patentable over Ikeda et al. Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 15115/108001).

Dated: February 14, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By #45,079
Jonathan P. Osha THOMAS SCHERER
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant